

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of September 7, 2007, in which the Examiner (1) rejected claims 2, 4, 23, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the JunglePort services, items U through W in PTO-892 ("**JunglePort**") in view of Yellowpages.com, item U in PTO-892 ("**Yellowpages.com**"), (2) rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **JunglePort** and **Yellowpages.com** as applied to claim 2, further in view of Official Notice ("**Official Notice**"), and (3) rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **JunglePort** and **Yellowpages.com**, further in view of **Beard**, item X in PTO-892.

By this present amendment, Applicant has amended claim 7 and has added new claim 27.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims and requests reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

As Applicant pointed out in earlier responses, because of the intense competition in the yellow pages industry and the need for developing strong consumer recognition of a yellow pages brand (in order to market the value of the brand to prospective advertisers), it is a significant advantage for a user to see the brand and source of the yellow pages listings (with selected additional directory items) that are displayed on a portable device using the method as claimed. Thus, both independent claims 23 and 26 recite, in addition to other limitations, "accessing the information items at an on-line directory website" and "automatically placing branding information in the information shopping cart with the information items, so that the branding information is displayed at the portable device with the information items, wherein the branding information identifies the operator of the directory website."

In the latest Office Action, the Examiner recognizes the shortcomings of the primary reference **JunglePort** (see Page 7 of the Examiner's Remarks). **JunglePort** does not disclose an on-line yellow pages directory website (rather it is map-based, with a person using those maps to download other items), and does not disclose downloading branding identifying the operator of a yellow pages website. To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner combines

JunglePort with **Yellowpages.com**, stating that **Yellowpages.com** "teaches a yellow pages directory service website, complete with branding indicia (i.e., Yellowpages logo) displayed at the top of every web page." The Examiner states that the combination of **JunglePort** and **Yellowpages.com** render Applicant's claims obvious because they suggest variations that "would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art" (see pages 7 and 8 of the Examiner's Remarks).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, **JunglePort** does not disclose downloading its own brand to a portable website. Thus, when considering **JunglePort**, there is no resulting predictability of downloading a yellow pages directory website brand with items from that website (even if yellow pages websites may have brands on their websites -- as disclosed in **Yellowpages.com**). Secondly, regardless of whether or not **JunglePort** discloses downloading its own brand, **JunglePort** is not a yellow pages website, and the existence of a yellow pages website (such as in **Yellowpages.com**) having a brand would not make downloading a yellow pages brand a mere predictable variation of **JunglePort**.

Claims 2, 4 and 25 each recite limitations in addition to those of independent claims 23 and 26, and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as stated above.

As to claim 6, the Examiner has cited Official Notice (i.e., it being well know for users to name files containing data) along with **JunglePort** and **Yellowpages.com**. Applicant respectfully points out that claim 6 recites elements in addition to receiving a file name from the user, such as:

"transmitting the file name with the information shopping cart to the PDA; and displaying the file name at the PDA."

The Examiner has not cited references teaching these additional elements, either alone or as combined with the other elements recited in or incorporated into dependent claim 6.

As to claim 7, the Examiner has cited **Beard** (for its teaching of converting various different formats such as Word, WordPerfect, Excel., etc. to a "standard Palm doc format") along with **JunglePort** and **Yellowpages.com**. However, in claim 7 (as amended for clarification), Applicant recites "converting the information shopping cart at the website into a

file format selected by the user from a plurality of formats," thus providing multiple possible formats for transmission rather than a single "standard Palm doc format" as in **Beard**. Claim 7 is thus distinguishable.

New claim 27 recites "an option selectable by the user...so that when the option is selected by the user, the driving directions for each of the information items is automatically added to each information item transmitted" (see Specification, Paragraph 29). Such a feature is not disclosed in any of the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen F. Jewett/
Stephen F. Jewett
Reg. No. 27,565

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFJ:bhr
61200095 v1